DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 728 SP 038 589

AUTHOR Weiner, Lois; Bloom, Arlene; Hall, Althea; Juncker, JoAnne; Obi, Roselynn; Pagano, Alicia; Rand, Muriel

TITLE Clarifying the Multiple Linkages between Curriculum and Instruction in Programs of Urban Teacher Preparation and State Educational Policy Promoting School Reform.

SPONS AGENCY Spencer Foundation, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE 1999-04-23
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Females; Higher Education; Politics of Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Public Education; *Sex Discrimination; Student Teachers; Teacher Educators; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *State Policy

ABSTRACT

This paper examines interrelationships between curriculum and instruction in an urban teacher education program and state educational policies promoting school reform. It notes how national policy talk and organizational strategies promoting systemic reform in schools serving low-income students influence the work of teacher educators preparing teachers for urban settings. The paper presents the experiences of seven teacher educators in an urban education program, comparing stated intentions of state policies for improving schools with actual effects observed by teacher educators. Cases are based on data collected by university faculty, including: field notes during visits to student teachers, evaluation reports of student teachers, notes about class incidents, and students' written classwork. Overall, the cases suggest that state policies adopted with the rationale of improving education in fact constrain faculty from helping students learn to teach against the grain of accepted practice in urban schools. The cases warn about the limitations of systemic reform as it is developing. They raise questions about how policies that seem reasonable and rational become destructive. The researchers suggest that the divide between teacher research and academic research in part results from disparity in the proportion of females in teaching and teacher education. Information and insights from female teacher educators working in programs that prepare urban teachers are missing in debate about educational reform. (Contains 68 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 431 728

Clarifying the Multiple Linkages between Curriculum and Instruction in Programs of Urban Teacher Preparation and State Educational Policy Promoting School Reform

Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association

April, 1999

Montreal, Canada

Lois Weiner, Arlene Bloom, Althea Hall, JoAnne Juncker, Roselynn Obi

Alicia Pagano, and Muriel Rand

New Jersey City University

Department of Administration, Curriculum, and Instruction

Jersey City, New Jersey 07305

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Juncker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Research for this paper was made possible in part by a grant from the Spencer Foundation to Lois Weiner, as part of a larger project. The authors are solely responsible for the views expressed.

SP038589

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What are the inter-relationships between curriculum and instruction in a program of urban teacher preparation and state educational policies promoting school reform? How have national policy talk and organizational strategies promoting "systemic reform" in schools serving low-income students (Ball, Cohen, Peterson & Wilson, 1994) influenced the work of teacher educators preparing teachers for urban schools and districts?

Using our experiences as teacher educators as a starting point, seven faculty members in their state's only program of teacher preparation with an explicitly urban mission, address these questions. In six cases, we describe the most salient manifestations of state policy in our work with prospective teachers. The cases serve as a starting point for analysis of the ways state policies intended to improve schools influence curriculum and instruction in the program of teacher preparation. Discussion includes broader implications of their findings, for researchers, policy makers and teacher educators.

Rationale and importance of topic

Historically, issues of curriculum and instruction in urban teacher preparation have been examined apart from federal and state educational policies promoting school improvement (Weiner, 1993). However, the "third wave" focus on systemic reform of schools (Lusi 1997) has called for attention to the inter-relationship between state policies to improve student achievement in urban schools, teachers' work in schools, their professional development, and alterations in teacher preparation (Darling-Hammond, 1998) (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996); (Brown, 1992);. Several concepts that are prominent in the move for systemic reform of schools have significant implications for the ways that programs of teacher education conceptualize and organize their course work and field experiences, but curiously, analyses by teacher educators of

the way reforms associated with the "third wave" are being played out in classrooms, theirs and the ones in which their students teach, are frequently absent from the policy discussion, along with voices of parents from communities that have not been well-served by schools (Foster, 1997), (Carr, 1997). Carr's review of the literature on systemic change (1997) points to serious disparity in the way systemic change is often defined and the description of actual change. Most often, current power systems were left unchanged, people's roles were not changed, power was not redistributed. In their examination of the way standards-based reform is being implemented, a group of teacher educators call attention to the practice in Utah and Florida of identifying dozens of behaviors teachers are supposed to exhibit in a 40 minute lesson. They comment that the drive to link classroom teaching more closely to higher standards has been "translated into trivial performance-based behaviors," (Bullough, Burbank, Gess-Newsome, Kauchak & Kennedy, 1998, p. 18). Systemic reform's actual impact may contrast sharply with its expressed intention of bringing higher-order teaching and learning to all schools (Cohen, 1995); (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Policy studies about the capacity of districts and schools as organizations to respond to reform show that districts vary widely in their implementation of state mandates to alter instruction (Spillane & Jennings, 1997). Studies of classrooms in restructured schools illuminate that surface-level compliance with the kind of instruction called for by advocates of systemic reform masks the continuation of old organizational policies in districts, as well as traditional teaching behaviors in classrooms (Elmore, Peterson & McCarthey, 1996) (Spillane, 1998).

This paper explores the influences of state educational policy on both university and public school classrooms, comparing the stated intentions of policies aimed at improving schools with

the actual effects, as observed by teacher education faculty. The state policies that are analyzed include the state's decision to assume control of an urban school district, its use of a test of minimum skills to assess academic achievement, creation and implementation of core curriculum standards that parallel the work of the New Standards Project, and implementation of a court-mandated requirement that the 28 lowest income districts in the state provide intensive early childhood education to all three and four year old children.

Our perspective differs from that of most researchers who conduct studies that analyze policy for several reasons that are related to the study's usefulness. Most critical is the differential nature of teacher preparation in the nation's research universities, as opposed to preservice teacher preparation in institutions that became liberal arts colleges after jettisoning their identity as normal schools (Herbst, 1989). The difference between teacher preparation in the nation's major research universities and former normal schools and state teachers colleges remains a critical but rarely acknowledged factor in reform. The "divide" that exists in support for research between university researchers and classroom teachers (Zeichner, 1995) is similarly present between faculty in research universities and institutions that are not (Howey, Arends, Galluzzo, Yarger & Zimpher, 1994), though it is seldom addressed in analyses of policy or teacher preparation.

The authors of this paper work in urban schools on a weekly basis, and we frequently teach students in graduate courses who serve as cooperating teachers in our program of teacher preparation. In addition, the authors are faculty in a program of teacher preparation that is large enough to have separate components of elementary, secondary, and early childhood teacher preparation but small enough so that faculty have different intellectual and organizational

responsibilities. Hence we do not share many of the characteristics of teacher education faculty in the research university's school of education, particularly separation by discipline and isolation from life in classrooms and schools (Tom, 1998), (The Holmes Group, 1995). In contrast to the difficulties that researchers from different intellectual backgrounds face when they analyze teaching together, our work with prospective teachers and practicing teachers in schools has generated a "common language for talking to each other." (Elmore, et al., 1996, p. introduction) We suggest that studies such as ours, by education faculty who view classrooms close-up because of their teaching responsibilities, open a different and important window onto the understanding of policy implementation. Our data and insights about the effects of reforms can aid policy analysts in their own learning about systemic reform (Wilson, Peterson, Ball & Cohen, 1996).

Our perspective is also informed by our work in a program of teacher preparation that has an explicitly urban mission in a university with an oft-stated commitment to urban education. Most urban teacher preparation consists of small projects within much larger programs, temporary ventures funded by "soft" money (Haberman, 1996), which gives them an experimental character. In contrast, an orientation to urban schools is embedded in our entire program; education faculty are recruited and hired with the clear understanding that their work will take them into urban schools. Unlike the teacher educators in the RATE VII study of teacher preparation in the urban context, we have no "apprehensions" about working in inner-city schools (Howey, et al., 1994, p. 5). Thus, our view of how state educational policy has influenced instruction has been informed by our long-standing involvement with urban schools, as well as our own program of urban teacher preparation.

The Study: Context, Data Collection, and Methodology

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Six cases address different aspects of curriculum and instruction in the undergraduate teacher preparation program in Urban University, a public teaching university in a populous state in the northeast United States. Both Urban University and its College of Education have an explicitly urban mission. Its undergraduate programs in elementary and early childhood education have received NCATE accreditation, but a continuing problem and source of concern has been many graduates' low scores on the general knowledge portion of the Praxis/NTE, needed for certification. Many students attend part-time because they must work to support themselves and family. In 1998-99, approximately 25 secondary students completed the program, 25 early childhood, and 50 elementary.

The university is located in the state's urban corridor but it serves a highly diverse student population drawn from the state's two largest cities, Ferristown and Urbanville, as well as small suburbs and rural areas. A good many students in teacher education in Urban University resemble the profile of the typical prospective teacher nationally: Female European-American, young, mono-lingual (Zimpher, 1989). However, in a study faculty conducted of student motivations for choosing teaching as a career, they found that a majority of students in the program had grown up and been educated in urban areas (Weiner, Obi, Pagano & Swearingen, 1993). Also, mirroring the immigrant population of Urbanville and the adjacent communities, significant number of students in the program are bilingual speakers of English and Spanish or languages like Creole, Tagalog, Arabic, and Urdu.

Five of the state's 28 poorest school districts are located in the same county as Urban University, and Urban University itself is located across the street from the Urbanville high school that is most racially segregated. In an initiative that has had political support from both political

parties, the state government has taken control of both Ferristown and Urbanville, attributing the schools' low scores on the state competency test and high dropout rates to endemic mismanagement (Corcoran & Scovronick, 1998). Urbanville schools have been in receivership for 11 years, Ferristown schools were taken over two years ago.

State educational policy has been influenced by aggressive legal advocacy by proponents of equalizing school funding, and the courts have ruled favorably on a series of cases that have forced the state legislature to provide more money for the state's 28 poorest school districts, among them Ferristown and Urbanville (Corcoran & Scovronick, 1998). The other major policy initiative in educational reform has been promulgation of new state standards that more or less parallel the recommendations of the New Standards Project and major subject matter professional organizations of teachers. The new core curriculum standards have been put in place along side the state's competency test, which is primarily a multiple choice test of basic skills (Corcoran & Scovronick, 1998). Teacher certification requirements for undergraduate programs in the state mandate that all students must graduate with a liberal arts major. Education courses in the certification sequence may not total more than 30 credits, and three field experiences are mandated.

All of the cases in this paper stem from faculty work in the program of undergraduate teacher preparation, which takes as its starting point the paradigm of the "reflective urban practitioner." Although department members do not always agree about organizational issues, they are cohesive in support of constructivist teaching and the program's urban mission. They share a commitment to prepare teachers who can work with children and families from diverse cultures. Eleven full-time faculty, 9 female, comprise the department; one faculty member is

African and another African American. Certification in special education is handled by a separate department, as are literacy education and English as a second language. Most students at Urban University complete their student teaching in schools in the metropolitan area. For the most part, supervision of field experiences is done by full-time faculty, who customarily observe each student teacher between six and eight times in the fifteen week semester. All faculty at Urban University carry a teaching load of 12 credits a semester; supervision of a student teacher is compensated at one credit.

The cases are based on data collected by Urban University faculty during the Spring 1998 and Fall 1998 semesters. Data include faculty field notes during visits to student teachers in schools, faculty evaluation reports of student teachers, notes taken about incidents in classes, and students' written work submitted for classes. In addition, one case is based on faculty recollections about classroom incidents that were not recorded but were communicated to colleagues in informal discussions.

The cases and analysis follow in the interpretivist family of research (Erickson, 1986). They are written in the tradition of the researcher who is an active participant and supporter of a project but is able to bring a critical perspective. We attempt to be "empirical without being positivist...rigorous and systematic" (Erickson, 1986, p. 119) in our investigation of the meaning the actors in the cases attach to their actions, as well as the connections between the cases and the policy environment. The viewpoint and voice of the cases are that of the teacher educator. We acknowledge this particular perspective in order to clarify that other perspectives are possible, meaningful, and different. Biklen observes that a feminist perspective demands that in analyzing teaching one must assume a particular vantage point, though other perspectives are, of necessity,

minimized (Biklen, 1995). We concur with Howe's analysis of the "interpretive turn" in educational research and the commitment that researchers must attempt to present the data as objectively as possible (Howe, 1998).

The cases are 500 words, written in first person, to encourage full scrutiny of the authors' perspectives and voice. After the group met and decided to collaborate on a project analyzing the relationship of state educational policy to our program of urban teacher preparation, individual faculty members wrote cases that they thought illustrated some aspect of state policy. One month later we met in a second meeting, reading the cases and suggesting revisions. In several instances an author's frame on the experience was challenged by a colleague's questions, which were in turn informed by her first-hand knowledge of the school sites, the students, and of our preparation program. This session was audiotaped. After all of the cases were presented and critiqued, contributors then analyzed the implications of the cases, taken individually and collectively. Using written notes and the audiotape, Lois Weiner wrote a draft. This preliminary version was critiqued at a third meeting of the authors and in individual conversations with people who could not attend the conference because of obligations to students and family members. Although in this third meeting authors of the cases sometimes wished to rewrite them to clarify points, no revision of the cases was permitted. Based on discussions of the draft and suggestions from all of the participants, Lois Weiner revised the paper. The process of creating this paper was begun in January, during intersession, and continued through April.

The Cases

Dr. Meyer's Case: Enforcement of Curricular Mandates in the State's Takeover of Urbanville - A Tightening Noose

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

My case examines the experiences of two student teachers in the small secondary English program. Giovanni, a mature student who had emigrated from Italy as an adolescent and had received a classical education in Italy, and Richard, an exuberant young man who came to Urban University because of the athletic scholarship he was offered. Both men student taught at Hancock High School, the largest of three comprehensive high schools in Urbanville. It serves a highly diverse student body of 2500 students. The "report card" issued on the school in 1997 showed its passing rates on the state's competency test to be 77% in reading, 92.8% in math, 90.1% in writing. The drop-out rate was 10.9%.

Giovanni, who had received a classical education in Italy before he emigrated as an adolescent with his family, was placed with Mr. Allenori., a teacher at Hancock for twenty years. Mr. Allenori is soft-spoken with colleagues and students and was identified by the department head as a conscientious teacher known for adhering to school rules and policy. Richard, who comes from a working class family and often used terms like "youse guys" when he spoke, was academically unprepared for his student teaching. He confided to me that he was "bitter" that the college had considered his academic achievement subordinate to his athletic contribution. Richard was assigned to work with Mr. Pyle, a former actor who developed and headed Hancock High's dramatic arts program. A dynamic teacher who exuded enthusiasm for his subject and students, Mr. Pyle had won the award for the state's "teacher of the year."

When Mr. Pyle and Richard met with me, we agreed on a course of action to help Richard improve his mastery of usage and standard English, as well as assuming responsibility for Mr.Pyle's sophomore English classes, containing students who had failed the state competency test. In our conference, Giovanni, Dr. Meyer, and Mr. Allenori concurred that Giovanni would

teach the senior classes assigned to Mr. Allenori and help with the film course Mr. Allenori had developed and taught.

As the term progressed, Richard flourished as a teacher, modeling Mr. Pyle's warm but firm stance towards the students, exuding the kind of energy that made Mr. Pyle's classroom lively and animated. My bi-weekly evaluations note approvingly that Richard experimented with the student-centered ideas he had been taught in his methods courses. On the other hand, Giovanni hewed to traditional practices and complained of feeling restrained by Mr. Allenori. Pressed by me to negotiate this with Mr. Allenori, Giovanni resisted. In a conference held mid-semester, Mr. Allenori complained that he too felt constrained, by the strict curricular mandates the state imposed. Students in every class faced standardized midterm exams and finals, so he felt he couldn't permit Giovanni to diverge from the curriculum the state had established for seniors. Teachers were subject to surprise visits by monitors who could give them unsatisfactory evaluations for failing to follow the curriculum, evaluations that they could not contest. Mr. Allenori pointed to the latest effort to mandate instruction, a directive by the state-appointed Superintendent that in every English class students practice writing essays for the competency test, even in classes composed of students who had passed the test, like seniors in the film elective.

Both students completed their student teaching and became certified to teach. Mr. Pyle left Hancock the next year, for a job in a high school specializing in performing arts, in an urban district in another state. Mr. Allenori remained at Hancock. In November 1998, teachers of Urbanville conducted a bitter week-long strike about the state's over-regulation of curriculum and instruction, especially surprise visits by monitors.

Dr. Sand's Case: Debby Diamond

Debby is enrolled in the English education program. She is a returning student after being in the work force for 22 years. Debby was my student in the second field experience, a course taken concurrently with educational psychology. As junior interns go over theories and principles in the class, they are required to connect the theory with the practice in the schools through the use of several student centered problems, tasks, observations and reflections.

Debby, a mother of three children enrolled in the public school, brought to her course work a great curiosity and commitment to improving education. But her first visits to school made her feel like she "had wandered onto the set of a lost episode of Star Trek. The rowdy crowded halls, run down buildings with falling and chipped plaster, the smell of sweat and disinfectant, the stultifying heat and humidity gave me an eerie sense of deja vu." Initially, her co-operating teacher, Miss Marbles, informed her that she had absolutely no use and no time for student teachers and felt far too overworked. Debby learned that Miss Marbles never took any education theory classes in order to obtain her certification, and although she has taught high school English for several years, she has both her undergraduate and her masters in the field of social science.

At first, Debby concluded that the theories in her educational theory classes do not exist in the "real" world. In the subsequent classroom visits, after the initial shock and disappointment, she began to observe the students behaviors and became aware of the similarities and differences in the students, noting that only students in the honors classes operated on higher level thinking skills and that the teacher interacted with groups differently according to their level and grade. In mid-semester, Debby commented that emphasis was on lecture, skills, drills and seatwork, as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

opposed to the problem-solving, constructivist practices they were learning about in the classroom in college.

However, towards the semester end, Debby began to note positive things about Miss Marble's teaching practices. She reinforced the students positively, employed the use of peer teaching, and managed her class effectively without raising her voice. She treated her students with respect and the students responded in kind. Miss Marbles set high expectations which were clear, interacted well with her students, and while they may not have be thrilled with the content of the class, Debby reported that they were very forthright about their positive feelings towards Miss Marbles.

At the end of her experience Debby concluded that though there were positive things she observed on certain occasions, she concluded that Miss Diamonds would benefit from exposure to more effective teaching strategies. Debby's perseverance and intelligence made the placement work in producing critical analysis of teaching and learning. I am not sure that other students would have been equally successful. It took a Debby Diamond to see the complexities of Miss Marbles' classroom.

Dr. Black's Case: A "Professional Development School" That Failed Where Others Succeeded

Using ideas culled from successful models of school/university partnerships such as the Coalition of Essential Schools and literature of the Effective Schools movement, I set out to build a working partnership with one school in Urbanville to transform it into a "professional development school" that would work with our certification program in mutually beneficial ways.

I contacted a principal who was enthusiastic about bringing reform to her failing elementary school. Our agreement was that in exchange for the assurance of several slots for both our junior and senior interns, I would assist in coordinating professional development activities within the school, mentor teachers, students, and staff who were interested in exploring new methodologies, and offer graduate-level courses on the school site. The principal and I met and planned frequently, I offered in-service workshops specific to the school and teachers and the agreed-upon goals, and I assisted classroom teachers as well as supervised student interns on the site. While the principal with whom I worked agreed again and again that emphasis on specific test-taking skills should not be the focus of instruction to the exclusion of other, more constructivist practices, pressure from the district was continually exerted on the principal and staff to demonstrate efforts to improve standardized test scores.

After three years there was no noticeable change in the classrooms nor in the performance of the school as a whole. The principal left the school for a principalship in a neighboring district. And I abandoned my efforts to bring change to the school.

Another PDS project in Urbanville, begun at about the same time, was initiated by a faculty member in a private university. That faculty person had been part of the state team that took over administration of Urbanville several years prior. Administrative cooperation between the schools, the district, and the private university occurred by virtue of its top-down origination with high-ranking administrators. However, my interviews with classroom teachers and aides within those "Professional Development Schools"revealed that changes enacted were primarily in the provision of in-service workshops by university faculty. During the second year of that project, teachers were forced by the state-appointed administrators in Urbanville to make test preparation a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

priority. Under watchful eyes of teams sent in surprise visits to monitor instruction, teachers and principals in the "Professional Development Schools" abandoned virtually all other activities that were not directly related to preparation for standardized tests. The schools, however, remain, in name, "Professional Development Schools" and are publicized as such by both the private university and Urbanville school administrators.

The school "report cards" in Urbanville show that there has been no substantial change in school performance since the state takeover.

Dr. Dina's Case: "What do I do?"

Tara is a serious art history major who is also completing her senior field experience in the elementary teacher education program. In addition to her college responsibilities she is a working artist who also works as a waitress at night and is planning her wedding which will take place shortly after graduation. Tara expressed excitement about her student teaching assignment because it brought an opportunity to implement the teaching strategies she learned and in her methods courses. She is confident she can make a difference in children's lives and change the world so that it is a better place for all.

Tara was assigned to Front Street Elementary School in Baytown, a medium- sized school district abutting Urbanville. She immediately established good rapport with Mrs. Singer, her experienced, well-dressed, organized cooperating teacher. Mrs. Singer's classroom is neatly decorated with student art work created from patterns; each child has colored the otherwise identical objects differently. The fifth grade students in Mrs. Singer's classroom are seated in rows and always are on task. I can see on my visits that the students in her class view

Tara as a gentle, soft-spoken, sensitive teacher who is concerned with their welfare and development. However, despite my encouraging Tara to teach in a student-centered ways, her lessons generally remained teacher-directed. In addition, during conferences, Tara and I discussed the need for developmentally appropriate creative arts education that enhances the creativity and self-expression of children. The topic wasn't new to Tara because she has researched arts education and an artist herself, Tara is opposed to the use of patterns with 10 year old fifth graders. From her course work, Tara is familiar with approaches to teaching art that she feels are more appropriate and recalls her own distaste for patterns in art when she was a student. Tara complained "This not the way I want to teach but the way Mrs. Singer wants me to. What do I do?"

When Tara and I reviewed one of the two video tapes I require my supervisees to do, the camera focused on Tara conducting a "round-robin" in reading. Tara seemed to be upset and uncomfortable. " We learned so many great reading strategies in Dr. Bird's class. Can I use them? No. Mrs. Singer wants round-robin. This is not what I want to do. But, what do I do?"

Dr. McSorley's Case: Rethinking Education

"I was so angry, sooo angry that I had to write this paper five times. The other papers were just too angry, " said Marie. Beth chimed in. "I'm angry too. This article says that just because I'm white, I can't teach minorities. And it's even written by a white woman. This is so prejudiced. " These were the opening statements in our second class of the undergraduate capstone course, "Rethinking Education," as we began our open discussion on the reading assignment from "Keepers of the American Dream" by Christine Sleeter. Thirteen students are

European American and one is African American, all are female. All students have either completed their student teaching or are doing it while they take this course so that they will graduate as education majors, in addition to being certified to teach.

The thought that anyone might question their ability to treat all children in their student teaching classes equally was unthinkable. "I was brought up in this urban community, and I never saw racism in my classes, and I always will treat all children equally in my classes," continued Marie who was still visibly upset.

I was surprised at this outburst. Usually students begin the course cautiously. They analyze the readings at a surface level, but gradually develop the skills to share thoughtful, reflective critiques as they discuss assigned readings in class. Students had never before demonstrated such a volatile response to this reading. I reaffirmed their right to express their views openly in this class, but added, "We also should be able to explain why we have interpreted the reading in this manner and to participate in an open dialog with each other." Each person gave her analysis of the reading and described her personal version of the "American Dream" which often included a belief that if they work hard, they can achieve it. Their anger gradually dissipated, and we moved to broader societal questions that led us to consider the impact of the teacher's American Dream on her/his teaching children for whom the dream might have different meanings. By the time the class ended, they were beginning to see the article from a different viewpoint, not ready to give up their current beliefs about themselves, but not as threatened.

By the end of the semester, students commented that "I never thought about these issues before" and "Now I look at education more critically" and "Now I'm not afraid to ask

questions and to take action."

This course is not required of all students because the state allows only 30 credits in a program of teacher preparation, and introductory course work and field experiences consume all 30 credits. Taking the two courses to become an education major frequently means that students must delay graduation for an extra semester, which is a financial hardship or impossibility for most students in our program.

But where else will they have this opportunity to reflect about the educational system AFTER the experience of having their own classroom? Where will they develop the attitude and skills to move beyond their own cultural frame of reference, to be proactive rather than reactive as professionals in the field of education?

Dr. Grant's Case: Are Urban Teachers Prepared to Meet the Educational needs of Young Children?

When I arrived at 1st Street school for my second supervisory visit, Marcia, my student teacher greeted me in the hall outside the classroom. She is placed in a kindergarten in a K-8 elementary school in our local city's school district.

"Dr. Grant, I need to talk to you," Marcia greeted me with a nervous look. "I'm a little worried about your observation. You see, I've planned a lesson that I don't think you're going to like very much, but my cooperating teacher wanted me to do it this way. She is very concerned about getting children ready for the standardized testing that begins in a few weeks. I thought it was best if I just did the lesson the way she would teach, since it's really her classroom." She went on to explain what she was planning to do with the children.

"Have you explained to her any of your reasons for wanting to plan activities differently?" I asked

"Oh, sure. But whenever I begin to explain what we learned to do in our methods courses, she tells me that I'm in the real world now and to forget that stuff I learned in classes. According to her, it doesn't really work."

Unfortunately, these are words I've heard before from my student teachers in our early childhood teacher preparation program at Urban University. We struggle with the difficulty in finding field placements sites that model the developmentally appropriate practice that we advocate at the university. One of the real difficulties we have is finding cooperating teachers who have specialized training in early childhood education. Marcia's cooperating teacher has taught 6th and 7th grade for 12 years and was moved to kindergarten when there was an opening to cover two years ago. She has gotten very little professional support in this transition and I can see that her methods show a lack of understanding of the developmental needs of young children.

Unfortunately, our state teacher certification does not mandate early childhood course work or field experiences and that certification is very broad: Nursery through 8th grade. Marcia's situation is not unusual. Although urban schools like this one give a lot of lip service to the importance of early childhood education, teachers are often pushed into using inappropriate curriculum by principals or supervisors. Teachers often receive neither pre-service nor in-service training in early childhood education. As a result, we have a lack of classrooms that provide good models of early childhood practices to support the apprenticeship of our student teachers. Our students quickly learn exactly what Marcia's cooperating teacher told her: that the teaching philosophy and methods they've learned in college are idealistic and won't work in the real world

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of urban teaching.

Analysis and Discussion

Although the cases examine different aspects of the teacher preparation program, certain common elements exist, primarily a sense that state policies that have been adopted with a rationale of improving education in fact constrain faculty from helping students learn to "teach against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 1991) of accepted practice in urban schools. For instance, the state policy limiting teacher education to thirty credits in an undergraduate program, which was adopted when the undergraduate major in education was replaced by the requirement that all teachers have liberal arts degrees, means that only a limited number of students can take the Rethinking Education course. This in turn cuts students off from revisiting their beliefs, a process that much research indicates is essential in changing preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching students who are culturally different from themselves (Winitzky & Barlow, 1998) (Nelson-Barber & Mitchell, 1992);; (Bullough & Stokes, 1994), (Cochran-Smith, 1995), a critical issue in urban teacher preparation. Perhaps the entire program might be reconceptualized to include more attention to altering teacher education students' attitudes toward the "minority" students who are a statistical majority in most urban schools, but this would not address the problem of allowing preservice candidates enough opportunity to both spend time in field experiences and enroll in courses that allow the reading and discussion that seem to be essential elements of the "long and labor-intensive process" (Gomez, 1996, p. 120) described in studies that report success in altering attitudes and beliefs of preservice teachers (Bullough & Stokes, 1994); (Tellez, Hlebowitsh & Norwood, 1995); (Liedel-Rice, 1995), (Cochran-Smith, 1995); (Finney & Orr, 1995).

Dr. Grant's case similarly illustrates that the state's requirements for certification, in this

instance the absence of a specific license for early child education, contradict the DOE's calls for developmentally appropriate instruction for young children and the program's efforts to make early childhood education culturally responsive as well. Urban schools are among those that have teachers in classroom situations for which they are unlicensed or inadequately prepared (Winfield & Manning, 1992) and are most likely to hire uncertified teachers (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996), so it should come as no surprise that the sites in Ferristown and Urbanville that Urban University uses for student teaching staff the early grades with teachers who have not been exposed to course work about the developmental needs of young children. Still, the disregard that many urban schools show for the special preparation early childhood educators require echoes the state's licensure requirements, which are now under review.

In their focus on conditions of teaching and learning in urban schools, the cases of Dr. Grant, Dr. Meyer, Dr. Dina, and Dr. Black seem to reinforce the critique of early advocates of school restructuring, who argued that school improvement depended primarily on altering school organization "to accommodate new and adventurous kinds of teaching" (Elmore, et al., 1996, p. Introduction (ix)). Another element appears to be that conditions in urban schools keep teacher education faculty from providing the kinds of field experiences and socialization that prospective teachers need to become effective urban teachers and master techniques of culturally responsive pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995); (De Leon, Stallings & Kurz, 1998); (Tiezzi & Cross, 1994). In this regard the cases can be interpreted as supporting key elements of systemic reform and more research of the sort being done by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, which aims to provide information on how to improve the quality of classroom practice through system wide integration of policies (National Institute on Educational Governance, 1998). In their

identification of the limitations of fieldwork as it is currently carried out, the cases might seem to support the call for Professional Development Schools (The Holmes Group, 1995) as a critical piece in school improvement. They could be used to support the view that systemic reform is on the right track in advocating that state, federal, and local policies be aligned to synchronize and coordinate teacher preparation, school reform, and change in classroom practice (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996) (Lusi, 1997),, and that the situation in their state reflects the disparities among states in pursuing an agenda of systemic reform (Cohen, 1995). Thus, one interpretation of the cases is that problems occur because the state is still mired in the old piecemeal approach to reform rather than attempting to reform the education system as a whole. In this line of thinking, presented for example by Lusi (1997) in her analysis of the role of state departments of education in complex school reform, the solution would be for the department of education to be more active in aligning its educational policies, to link more closely regulation of teacher preparation, school restructuring, and curriculum and instruction. Both Dr. Meyer and Dr. Black's cases would seem to support this course of action because they illustrate that boosting student scores on the state's test of basic skills has become the *sine qua non* of reform, and as a result, instruction has focused on mastery of low-level skills.

But taken together the cases also warn about the limitations of systemic reform as it is taking shape. Two contradictory definitions of systemic reform exist in the literature of school reform. One, used by Carr (1997) in her review of the literature on systemic change, defines systemic change as an approach to change that recognizes the interrelationships and interdependencies among the parts of the educational system, as well as the interrelationships and interdependences between the educational system and its community. Advocates of the other type

of systemic reform, exemplified by the work of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) and the New Professional Teacher Project (Roth, 1996), seek state, district, and federal coordination of reforms to generate policies on curriculum and instruction, teacher preparation, and school restructuring that lead to learning and teaching of national standards, to insure that all students master higher-level thinking and content. In Carr's definition, systemic reform is "ecological" in the sense that it relies on support and involvement of communities served by schools (Weiner, 1993). Using this definition of systemic reform calls for renegotiation of power relations and suggests that schools should be considered democratic institutions that make parents partners (Seeley, 1985). But as Carr's literature review (1997) discloses, systemic reform has evolved in quite a different political direction. As Cohen notes, the movement for systemic reform has been composed mostly of educational professionals and members of political elites, and has no popular roots (Cohen, 1995, p. 16).

The cases in this paper can be understood as illustrating the need for "systemic reform" of the sort Carr defines. In their focus on the complexity of human relations, between the student teachers and their cooperating teachers, between student teachers and supervisors, between faculty and students, between university faculty and school staff, they illuminate the limitations of speaking of reform in language "of precisely engineered systems rather than language appropriate to ecological systems that evolve over time" (Raizen, 1998, p. 74). The alignment of policies that is the cornerstone of systemic reform is problematic for technical reasons to be sure (Spillane, 1998); (Spillane & Jennings, 1997), but we are likely to see that it is equally flawed because the language of systemic reform disguises its ideological assumptions (Apple, 1993). One aspect of reform that has been marginalized is analysis of the relationship between economic and social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

disintegration in the nation's cities and academic achievement of city children (Anyon 1997). Underlying the state's takeover of the Urbanville schools is the assumption that reforms that focus on schools and school people can, by themselves, improve students' achievement (Corcoran & Scovronick, 1998). Anyon's political economy of the Newark schools (1997) and her work in a professional development project in that school system (1995) point to a contradictory conclusion "... Until the economic and political systems in which the cities are enmeshed are themselves transformed so they may be more democratic and productive for urban residents, educational reformers have little chance of effecting long-lasting educational changes in city schools" (Anyon, 1997, p. 13).

Anyon's criticism that current debate about improving academic achievement of poor, minority students does not take into account the historical and contemporary conditions of urban communities could be aimed at the cases as well. Not one case discusses parents or community, the social context of the schools. The absence is curious because Urban University has an explicitly urban mission that is reflected in social foundations course work in the teacher preparation program. This absence of parents and community in the cases reflects the insularity of the Urbanville schools, their isolation from the communities they ostensibly serve, which is true of urban school systems throughout the country, and has been so since their creation a century ago (Weiner, 1993). Indeed, the absence of mention of community and parents in the cases can be seen as a powerful argument for defining systemic reform in terms that eschew the notion that schools and school reform are the exclusive concern of educational professionals, as Gittell argues has occurred (1998). Her solution is to create a new paradigm for reform int he 21st century that integrates schools into communities and enhances citizens roles. "Broadening our perspective of

the context in which schools function, as well as our definition of education, will encourage new stakeholders to form coalitions to create new institutions at the community level (Gittell, 1998, p. 239).

The cases raise questions about the ways that policies that seem eminently reasonable and rational become destructive. For instance, Dr. Meyer and Dr. Black's cases illuminate the political problems associated with establishing accountability. Designating accountability in urban school systems is much more easily described (Darling-Hammond & Ascher, 1991) than enacted. When the state assumed control of Urbanville schools based on students' performance on standardized measures of achievement, it invested those tests and scores with a legitimacy that it has not been able to disavow. Thus the state's adoption of the new standards that call for higher-order thinking is all but meaningless in Urbanville schools, where faculty and administrators face consistent pressure from the state itself to make improvement of test scores their primary activity.

The advocacy of professional development schools as a vehicle of school reform (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995), (The Holmes Group, 1995), (Houston, Hollis, Clay, Ligons & Roff, 1999), (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996) seems to ignore the problems that Dr. Black's case raises, issues illuminated in empirical research about the experiences teacher educators report they have when establishing collaborations with urban schools (Howey, et al., 1994), (Su, 1999), (Kochan, 1999). Though "many people are making valiant efforts to support professional development schools...the effort is time intensive and requires long-term individual commitment. Although positive comments and numerous benefits are being reported, the hoped-for 'reinvented institutions' do not seem to be forming" (Kochan, 1999, p. 187). Dr. Black learned the hard way that not all schools that are labeled as

"Professional Development Schools" differ substantively from schools without this nomenclature. A professional development school in which teachers are learners, one in which the faculty is empowered requires significant institutional support from both school districts and universities (Su, 1999). Professional development schools, which probably number no more than 200, are labor-intensive and costly, to both school districts and universities (Bullough, et al , 1998).

For the most part, discussion of the costs of improved collaboration between schools and universities is absent from analysis of systemic reform. In one of the most pointed examples, the authors of "What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future," <<National Commission on Teaching and America's Future 1996 - Not Found>> expressly stipulate that school restructuring must occur without significantly more money. Reform will be possible "only if system wide efforts are made to free up resources from the many crevices of bureaucracies where they are now lodged..."(p. 104). Systemic reform seems to be based on an implicit acceptance of the fact that "spending money on teacher education is politically unattractive." (Cohen, 1995, p. 15) Spring explains this phenomenon by describing the research networks that influence research design and results. He argues that because of the relationship between power and knowledge in the politics of urban education, researchers who focus one effectiveness of implementation miss critical trends, like the diminishing financial support for public education (Spring, 1992).

But isn't collaboration essential between schools and schools districts? What role should the state play in fostering linkages between programs of teacher preparation and urban schools? Haberman (1996) argues that university-based teacher preparation won't be changed so urban teacher preparation is best accomplished under the purview of urban school systems. He maintains that there is no way new teachers can be trained under the aegis of an urban school system and

remain unresponsive to such formidable constituencies as strong parent and community groups. Preparation by urban school systems, combined with teacher recruitment and selection, to weed out the "stars" and "quitter/failures" are the solution to preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools (Haberman, 1996, p. 755).

Dr. McSorley's case, to which we will return, and research on programs that have succeeded in altering teachers' beliefs (Liedel-Rice, 1995), (Tellez, et al., 1995), (Winitzky & Barlow, 1998), (Cochran-Smith, 1995), make Haberman's assertions problematic. Within our study, the cases of Dr. Dina and Dr. Grant seem to provide a justification for state policies that link programs of teacher preparation and school districts. Dr. Dina's description of her work with Tara and Dr. Grant's analysis of Marcia's problem suggest that if Urban University could find field placements that were compatible with the program's aims, students would master the constructivist teaching that Urban University teacher education faculty encourage. Both Dr. Dina and Dr. Grant's cases seem to imply that to master constructivist teaching, student teachers need to practice the ideas they learn in their university-based course work in classrooms of supportive teachers. To locate and develop such placements, Urban University would have to develop relations with local schools, a process that would certainly be aided by state policies encouraging and supporting closer relations between the institutions, for instance providing financial incentives for universities and school districts to allow teacher education faculty to work in public schools for extended periods and school district to loan classroom teachers to programs of teacher preparation to serve as clinical faculty. Dr. Dina and Grant's cases probably support the concept of co-reform of both schools and programs of teacher preparation, to create a synergy between Urbanville schools and Urban University's teacher education program. State policies that

encourage collaboration would be helpful, if they were created with the understanding that there is no "algorithm for the specifics of how co-reform programs should be developed or how they should work." (Glickman, Lunsford & Szuminski, 1995). Reforms of this sort would be part of the kind of systemic reform that Carr defines (1997).

The cases show why the warning against mandating co-reform, of creating "algorithms" is essential. In Dr. Sand's case we see a phenomenon that contradicts the assumption that students need field work placements in classrooms of exemplary teachers. In at least this one case the absence of "fit" between the teacher education program and the schools is an advantage. Debby Diamond's conflict with Miss Marbles becomes, with the help of the faculty member, a profound learning experience that causes her to deepen her understanding of schooling's dilemmas. Debby sees a congruence between her own beliefs about teaching and learning and the constructivist orientation of her instructor and the program, but dissonance occurs in the field placement. Debby's experience echoes that of students in Hollingworth's study (1989) who were placed with teachers whose teaching philosophies and practices did not reflect their own or the constructivist orientation of the teacher preparation program. Hollingsworth's students used the dissonance to critically examine their own practice and ideals, whereas those who were placed with teachers whose teaching was attuned with the program's philosophy were never forced to critique their ideas. They were able to simply follow the model of their cooperating teacher, but when these student teachers had their own classrooms, they were unable to implement these same practices. They lacked the theoretical knowledge and understanding that had come to their peers who had been forced to defend their ideas under the glare of the cooperating teacher's criticism.

Hollingworth's study (1989) calls into question whether the student teacher Richard,

described in Dr. Meyer's case, will actually be able to implement the student-centered teaching strategies he used in Mr. Pyle's classroom. Other research on teacher thinking, like work that questions whether preservice teachers have sufficient experience with teaching to tie their beliefs to teaching practice (Richardson, 1996) calls into question the assertion that effective urban teacher preparation necessarily requires field placements in urban schools with cooperating teachers who model appropriate pedagogy (De Leon, et al , 1998).

In Dr. McSorley's case, university-based course work creates a dissonance that students' field experiences have not. Students are pressed into critique by the readings and discussion that they have in class, on material that challenges their world view and cultural frame of reference. All of the students have done their student teaching or are doing it simultaneously as they take Dr. McSorley's course, yet the field placements and course work they have encountered have not challenged the students' beliefs that Dr. McSorley confronts in her course. For these prospective teachers, practice has produced no learning. It has been a case of practice making practice (Britzman, 1991). They exemplify the problem Valli (1995) describes, when the color-blindness of student teachers who are white obscures their "own dominating culture and behaviors." (Valli, 1995) Though we do not know what happens to the students in Dr. McSorley's class after the course, the case implies that their thinking has changed, that their understanding of teaching and learning has been altered by an understanding of education's rootedness in politics, as well as by a sense of their own agency as teachers. Dr. McSorley's case suggests that although change in strongly held beliefs and attitudes of preservice teacher candidates is indeed difficult to achieve (Finney & Orr, 1995) (Winitzky & Barlow, 1998);; (Cochran-Smith, 1995), it may be sparked in course work that is not directly linked to a supportive field experience (Bullough & Stokes,

1994) The change in teacher beliefs may be both intellectual and moral in nature (Ball & Wilson, 1996) and be ignited by a changed sense of self, subject matter, and politics (Kennedy, 1997). Rethinking Education provides an opportunity for students to revisit the issues that were presented in the program's introductory social and psychological foundations courses, which contain field work components. It is taught as a corequisite of another course, Rethinking Teaching, so that students enroll in an intensive 6 credit block together. Perhaps in the context of this program of urban teacher preparation Rethinking Education provides the type of intense experience that Winitsky and Barlow (1998) and Bullough and Stokes (1994) observe helped their students change their beliefs about diversity. The university-based course work in both Dr. McSorley and Sand's cases seemed to have provided the dissonance required for growth in teacher thinking (Hollingsworth, 1989).

Dr. Meyer's case indicates that the program has been unsuccessful in altering Giovanni's beliefs about instruction. But here, an absence of dissonance is responsible for Giovanni's failure to move beyond the teacher-centered strategies that he had experienced in his own education. Though Giovanni felt constrained by Mr. Allenori, his unwillingness to "teach against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 1991) was a matter of his own "grain" as well as the "grain" of his cooperating teacher and the school district. The characterological and pedagogical conservatism of both Mr. Allenori and Giovanni were buttressed by state educational policy designed to improve test scores in Urbanville. By establishing a highly centralized administration and enforcing a highly-circumscribed curriculum for the district, the state has undermined teachers' sense of self-efficacy. Yet, urban teachers with high self-efficacy engage in practices associated with high achievement gains for students (Chester & Beaudin, 1996). Perhaps the strike of Urbanville teachers, directed

against the state's enforcement of curricular mandates (Kissinger, 1998), marked an assertion of a collective sense of efficacy and their pride in their craft as teachers (Metz, 1987).

Making the issue even more complex is the differential impact of the same state policy on the two cooperating teachers, Mr. Allenori and Mr. Pyle, colleagues in the same department in Hancock High. Mr. Pyle's treatment of Richard mirrored his response to the challenge of working with students who were academically under-prepared. He regarded both as tasks to be accomplished. In a similar vein, he did not permit the standardized curriculum to be a barrier, rather he found ways to get around it, elbowing his personality and his values into the curriculum. Instruction in Mr. Pyle's class addressed both the requirements of the basic skills test and the new, higher-order thinking and writing skills of the core curriculum standards. Despite his success in teaching as he believed, Mr. Pyle left his position in Urbanville. On the other hand, Mr. Allenori, who remained, followed the curriculum, in line with his desire to follow procedures. Giovanni too conformed and failed to grow significantly as a teacher during the field experience. Mr. Allenori complied with the more powerfully-enforced mandate, to teach to the competency test, ignoring the other conflicting policy that encouraged instruction of higher-order thinking.

It is Tara's uneasiness with the dissonance between her own values and impulses and the established practice in her school, described by Dr. Dina in her case, that prevents Tara from carrying out instructional strategies that she believes, from her own experience, to be important. The problem is not Tara's beliefs about instruction, nor her lack of subject matter knowledge. Tara knows that she might, indeed, should teach art differently from Mrs. Singer. Tara, though, wants Dr. Dina to tell her what to do. Unlike Debby Diamond and the students in Rethinking Education who have critiqued their values about learning and confronted the issue of their own

power/powerlessness in schools, Tara expresses no opinion about social arrangements in schools. She seems unable to move beyond the contradiction between her values and beliefs about sound educational practice, ideas that have been presented in university courses, and Mrs. Singer's pressure to teach in ways that contradict her beliefs about art. Her question, "What should I do?" is directed to her university supervisor and calls for an answer from an authority to what in the end must be Tara's own moral decision. Though Dr. Dina describes Tara as a "serious" student of art history, Tara seems not experience the felt power of her ideas and beliefs, about education and art. But are we certain precisely what Tara thinks and believes? Because Dr. Dina knows Tara as a supervisor and not an instructor of course work, Dr. Dina has no access to any writing that Tara may have done about her ideas, her metacognitive strategies. Tara may be an example of the process Holt-Reynolds identifies, of preservice teachers having a "relatively unproblematic reaction to course ideas" without "sensing any potential discrepancies between these new ideas and the previously constructed beliefs about teaching they brought with them into the course" (Holt-Reynolds, 1995). What initially seemed to be a straightforward problem of a student buckling under to the pressure of a school culture and a cooperating teacher's authority may be another issue entirely: Tara's preparation to teach and her education have focused on acquisition of technical skills instead of "rationale building" and development of her consciousness of her own thinking processes, her metacognitive control (Holt-Reynolds, 1995, p. 134).

The other salient aspect of Tara's question, "What shall I do?" is that it is directed to her university supervisor. We suggest that in its directionality it recapitulates hierarchical relations of power and status in education (Herbst, 1989). It echoes with the infantilization of teachers (Erickson, 1987), the paternalistic relations among mostly male school principals and mostly

female elementary school teachers (Biklen, 1995), and power differentials within schools of education between faculty who spend time in schools and their colleagues in liberal arts (The Holmes Group, 1995). Tara's question could just as well be direct towards teacher educators who see the mismatch between the stated intentions of systemic reform and its actual impact (Bullough, et al., 1998), of the efforts to make schools, teachers, and teacher educators accountable for outcomes that they have had no voice in shaping (Foster, 1997), and of the relationship between gender, teaching, and research (Biklen, 1995).

This last issue is not one that we have explored in the paper heretofore, and cannot now because of space limitations. However, we note the invisibility of gender in much of the debate about systemic reform, an invisibility that our paper shares. Although all of the authors of this paper are women, not until we concluded our analysis did we see that gender was a significant factor in the cases, as well as our situation as teacher educators and researchers. Our experience confirms the feminist contention that social interaction is structured and power relations are obscured so that some questions about gender are never asked and phenomenon are unrevealed (Marshall, 1997). To illustrate this point we refer to the criticisms of the proposal for this paper, which, correctly in our opinion, identified a weakness in the proposal's lack of reference to existing scholarship about policy. Yet, our heavy teaching responsibilities, most especially the labor-intensive nature of supervising student teachers, make travel to professional conferences, publication, and reading quite problematic. The conditions under which we and other teacher educators of prospective urban teachers work (Howey, et al., 1994) mimic the inadequate resources of urban schools. Our ability to connect our data and analysis in this paper became possible only because one of the authors solicited and received substantial support from outside

the university for released time from teaching, for another research project. She was thus able to devote the time needed for writing our analysis and connecting it to existing policy studies

One interpretation of the absence of teacher educators' voices from discussions of policy development, implementation, and evaluation might be that they lack interest in these areas or professional commitment. But Biklen (1995) demonstrates that the traditional view of career commitment that has been used to show that female teachers are less serious about their jobs and profession, because they raise children, is flawed. Other indicators show that female teachers regard their professional obligations with at least as much importance as their male counterparts. They speak of their jobs with a seriousness that belies the conclusion that they are not committed to their work. However, they also regard with great urgency obligations to their families. We share Patai's concerns about dangers inherent in feminist arguments that personal concerns are political in nature (Patai, 1994), but the "personal" nature of the responsibilities that deter teacher educators from doing more research about policy are intricately woven into the fabric of political and social relations, and require close examination.

We suggest that the "divide" between teacher research and academic research (Zeichner, 1995) in part results from the "divide" of gender, the disparity in the proportion of females in teaching and teacher education. In higher education, women devote more time to teaching and less to research and are disproportionately in the lower academic ranks (Allen, 1998). Non-doctoral granting institutions certify 80% of the nation's teachers (Haberman 1996}, yet policy analysis about educational reform is dominated by researchers in schools of education that support doctoral programs, schools of education in which faculty who do the most prized research have little day to day contact with schools and teachers (The Holmes Group, 1995). A majority of

teacher educators who work in programs that prepare urban teachers are female (Howey, et al 1994), as are the vast majority of teachers (Zimpher & Ashburn, 1992). For the most part, information and insights from this hidden majority are missing in debate about educational reform.

The answer we give to Tara's question, "What shall I do now?" is to redirect it, back to Tara, as the question, "What should you do now?" In a similar fashion, we redirect Tara's question to ourselves: "What shall we do now?" and attempt to overcome the institutional barriers that deter female teacher educators from being heard in policy debates about urban school reform.

References

Allen, H. L. (1998). *Faculty workload and productivity: Gender comparison* [ERIC ED416776]. The NEA 1998 Almanac of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. W. (1993, Winter). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense? *Teachers College Record*, pp. 222-241.

Ball, D. L., Cohen, D. K., Peterson, P. L., & Wilson, S. M. (1994, April). Understanding state efforts to reform teaching and learning: The progress of instructional reform in schools for the disadvantaged. American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Ball, D. L., & Wilson, S. (1996, Spring). Integrity in teaching: Recognizing the fusion of the moral and the intellectual. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 155-192.

Biklen, S. K. (1995). *School work. Gender and the cultural construction of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice Makes Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Brown, C. (1992). Restructuring for a New America. In M. E. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 1-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bullough, R. V. J., Burbank, M., Gess-Newsome, J., Kauchak, D., & Kennedy, C. (1998). 'What matters most: Teaching for America's future?' A faculty response to the Report of the National Commission on teaching and America's future. *Journal of education for teaching*, pp. 7-32.

Bullough, R. V., Jr, & Stokes, D. K. (1994, Spring). Analyzing personal teaching metaphors in preservice teacher education as a means for encouraging professional development. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 197-224.

Carr, A. A. (1997, March). Systemic change: Critically reviewing the literature. American Educational Research Association. Chicago.

Chester, M. D., & Beaudin, B. Q. (1996, Spring). Efficacy beliefs of newly hired teachers in urban schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 233-257.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991, August). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, pp. 279-310.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995, Fall). Color Blindness and basket making are not the answers; confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 493-522.

Cohen, D. (1995, June). What standards for national standards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 751-757.

Corcoran, T., & Scovronick, N. (1998). More than equal: New Jersey's Quality Education ActM. Gitell (Ed.), (pp. 53-69). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998, January-February). Teachers and teaching: Testing policy hypotheses from a national commission report. *Educational researcher*, pp. 5-15.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ascher, C. (1991). *Creating accountability in big city school systems* [No. 102]. Urban Diversity Series. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995, April). Polices that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 597-604.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. M. (1996). Who teaches and why. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 67-101). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

De Leon, N. J., Stallings, J. A., & Kurz, T. B. (1998, April). Learning to teach in inner-city schools. American Educational Research Association. San Diego.

Elmore, R. F., Peterson, P. L., & McCarthey, S. J. (1996). *Restructuring in the classroom: Teaching, learning, and school organization*. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass Inc.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In Melvin Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 119-161). New York: MacMillan.

Erickson, F. (1987, December). Transformation and school success:The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and education quarterly*, pp. 335-336.

Finney, S., & Orr, J. (1995, November-December). 'I've really learned a lot but..' : Cross-cultural understanding and teacher education in a racist society. *Journal of Teacher Education*, pp. 327-333.

Foster, M. (1997). Race, gender and ethnicity. How they structure teachers' perceptions of and participation in the profession and school reform efforts. In B. J. Bank & P. M. Hall (Eds.), *Gender, equity, and schooling* (pp. 159-185). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Gittell, M. (1998). Conclusion: Creating a school reform agenda for the twenty-first centuryM Gitell (Ed.), (pp. 230-240). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Glickman, C. D., Lunsford, B. F., & Szuminski, K. A. (1995). Co-reform as an approach to change in education: The origin of revolution. In M. John O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating teachers for leadership and change. Teacher Education Yearbook, Vol 3* (pp. 11-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gomez, M. L. (1996). Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching 'other people's children. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 109-132). New York: Teachers College Press.

Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 747-760). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Herbst, J. (1989). *And Sadly Teach*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989, Summer). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 160-189.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1995). Preservice teachers and coursework: When is getting it right wrong? In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating teachers for leadership and change*. Teacher Education Yearbook, vol. III. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Houston, R. W., Hollis, L., Clay, D., Ligons, C. M., & Roff, L. (1999). Effects of collaboration

on urban teacher education programs and professional development schools. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools. Teacher Education Yearbook VII* (pp. 6-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Howe, K. R. (1998, November). The interpretive turn and the new debate in education. *Educational Researcher*, pp. 13-21.

Howey, K. R., Arends, R., Galluzzo, G., Yarger, S., & Zimpher, N. (1994). *RATE VII: Teacher preparation in the urban context*. Research About Teacher Education (RATE). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (44 pages).

Kennedy, M. M. (1997, October). The connection between research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, pp. 4-12.

Kissinger, B. (1998, 19 November). Strike talk takes toll. *Jersey Journal*, p. 1.

Kochan, F. K. (1999). Professional development schools. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools. Teacher Education Yearbook VII* (pp. 173-190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995, Fall). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 465-491.

Liedel-Rice, A. (1995, Fall). Touching the hands of urban children is a must for all. *Multicultural education*, pp. 21-22.

Lusi, S. F. (1997). *The role of state departments of education in complex school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Marshall, C. (1997). Undomesticated gender policy. In B. J. Bank & P. M. Hall (Eds.), *Gender,*

equity, and schooling (pp. 63-91). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Metz, M. H. (1987, January). Teachers' pride in craft, school subcultures, and societal pressures. *Educational Policy*, pp. 115-134.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's Future*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

National Institute on Educational Governance, F., Policy Making. (1998, April 1998). High performance learning communities: A new vision for American schools. *The policy forum*, pp. 1, 3.

Nelson-Barber, S. S., & Mitchell, J. (1992). Restructuring for diversity: Five regional portraits. In M. E. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 229-262). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Patai, D. (1994). When method becomes power (response). In A. Gitlin (Ed.), *Power and Method* (pp. 61-73). NewYork: Routledge.

Raizen, S. A. (1998, Fall). Standards for science education. *Teachers College Record*, pp. 66-121.

Roth, R. A. (1996). Standards for certification, licensure, and accreditation. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 242-278). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Seeley, D. S. (1985). *Education through partnership*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Spillane, J. P. (1998, Spring). State policy and the non-monolithic nature of the local school

district. Organizational and professional considerations. *American Educational Research Journal*, pp. 33-63.

Spillane, J. P., & Jennings, N. E. (1997, Spring). Aligned instructional policy and ambitious pedagogy: Exploring instructional reform from the classroom perspective. *Teachers College Record*, pp. 448-481.

Spring, J. (1992). Knowledge and power in research into the politics of urban education. In J. G. Cibulka, R. J. Reed & K. K. Wong (Eds.), *The politics of urban education in the United States* (pp. 45-55). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Su, Z. (1999). Creating an equal partnership for urban school and teacher education renewal. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools. Teacher Education Yearbook VII* (pp. 46-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Tellez, K., Hlebowitsh, P. S., Cohen, & Norwood, P. (1995). Social service field experiences and teacher education. In J. M. Larkin & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula* (pp. 65-78). Albany: State University of New York Press.

The Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*. East Lansing: The Holmes Group.

Tiezzi, L. J., & Cross, B. E. (1994, April). Research on prospective teachers" beliefs and urban field experiences. American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Tom, A. (1998, April). Professional development schools and the destabilization of faculty work [Symposium, "Constructing communities that foster the common good: Faculty and graduate students' diverse understandings of collaboration through a year in professional development schools"]. American Educational Research Association. San Diego.

Valli, L. (1995, March-April). The dilemma of race: Learning to be color blind and color conscious. *Journal of Teacher Education*, pp. 120-129.

Weiner, L. (1993). *Preparing teachers for urban schools: Lesson from thirty years of school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weiner, L., Obi, R., Pagano, A., & Swearingen, J. (1993). Choosing teaching as a career [ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 357 013].

Wilson, S. W., Peterson, P. L., Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1996, March). Learning by all. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 468-476.

Winfield, L. F., & Manning, J. B. (1992). Changing school culture to accommodate student diversity. In M. E. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 181-214). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Winitzky, N., & Barlow, L. (1998, April). Changing teacher candidates' beliefs about diversity. American Educational Research Association. San Diego.

Zeichner, K. M. (1995, n.d.). Beyond the divide of teacher research and academic research. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice*, pp. 153-172.

Zimpher, N. L. (1989, November-December). The RATE Project: A profile of teacher education student. *Journal of Teacher Education*, pp. 27-30.

Zimpher, N., & Ashburn, E. A. (1992). Countering parochialism among teacher candidates. In M. E. Dillworth (Ed.), *Diversity in teacher education* (pp. 40-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.